

the (height of the) whorl, and by the wanting constriction, especially in the columellar wall, not to speak of the size and shape of the whole shell. The lamellæ also show some marked differences, such as the presence of a high basal, the shorter columellar not reaching the base, but with relatively larger horizontal part, the bifurcation of the parietal and the presence of a supra-palatal, the last just as it is in *P. armifera*.

It must be added here that the specimen first obtained from Minnesota in several respects differs from those found in Illinois and Iowa, which I consider as typical; by its size which is $\frac{1}{3}$ smaller, by the basal lamella developed in a peculiar way, being rather longer at the truncated top than at its foot, and by the stronger, thicker palatal lamellæ. Yet, as there was only one specimen, it was liable to be an individual peculiarity—even then of interest. Should, however, more specimens be found with the same configuration, they would represent a distinct and well characterized variety; possibly it is a peculiar northern form.

New Philadelphia, Ohio, June, 1889.

ON MR. PILSBRY'S CRITICS UPON SOME AMERICAN SHELLS.

BY C. F. ANCEY.

In the 9th No. of the *Conchologists' Exchange*, Vol. II, 1888, p. 113, Mr. H. A. Pilsbry wrote: "On *Lyogyrus*, Gill, and other American shells," in which several subgeneric and specific names proposed by European scientists for N. American shells, particularly by Dr. Westerlund and myself are sharply criticised. Of course criticism is good whenever errors generally diffused are to be destroyed, and when not inconsiderate. I intended, at first, to write about this subject in "*Le Naturaliste*," where "some of Mr. Crosse's genera are so rudely handled," but I at length determined to insert my article in the same paper as that in which Mr. Pilsbry published his own note, in order to be read by the same naturalists.

It will be remarked at first, that before speaking about the new species proposed by such a man as Dr. Westerlund, an eminent conchologist, and certainly, together with Dr. W. H. Dall, the one who is the best acquainted with the conchological fauna of the Arctic countries, it would be well to compare either his shells with authentic specimens of those formerly described, or his *very accurate*

descriptions to those of the published species. I fail to discover the identity of *Valvata mergella*, Westerlund with *Valvata striata*, Lewis. The proportions of the shell, number of whorls, elevation of the spire, etc., etc., are not the same in the two species. I must add that Dr. Westerlund was certainly acquainted with either *Valvata sincera* or *striata*, as in the description of his *mergella*, he alludes to the 5 already described North American forms!

I have recently described under the name of *Liogyrus Lehnerti*, a shell that was sent me some five years ago, by Mr. E. Lehnert, who discovered it in the Potomac, together with Gould's shell. The operculum which I have not seen, proved to be Amnicoloid, hence the species should be called *Amnicola Lehnerti*. It is a sinistrorse, not "distorted" shell, and owing to the number of specimens already known, it may be termed a constant form, for not counting my two typical examples, Mr. Lehnert sent some to Mrs. Geo. Andrews, who wrote about these, saying in was "indeed an interesting shell," and besides those he undoubtedly possesses in his own cabinet, Mr. H. A. Pilsbry saw others that permitted him to ascertain its generic position. Distorted specimens are frequent, as the latter says, in fluviatile shells, but sinistrorse monstrosities are *very scarce*, and hitherto two or three species at most (*Limnea peregra*, *Melantho decisa*), normally dextral, have been found sinistral, and amongst these *no Amnicola*, although specimens of this genus are profusely distributed in suitable stations in Southern Europe, North Africa and North America. I hunted much for fluviatile shells in Europe, but never gathered any sinistral Amnicolæ and other fluviatile species, and frequently occurred to my notice trochoid or distorted specimens of *Planorbis*, some with part of the whorls entirely loose from the preceding ones; this I observed in *Planorbis nautilus*, *Planorbis complanatus*, and some of the allied species, also in a wonderful little shell found in 1884 by myself in the river named "Gave de Pau" in S. W. France, and perhaps a *Paladilhia*. (I never attempted to describe this single specimen, no other species of *Paladilhia*, having ever been discovered not even in that location by myself, but in that part of France, by other naturalists; hence I should reasonably suppose it is really new, as it is different from the other *Paladilhie* not only in this character, the last whorl being *entirely* detached, but still in shape.) The genus *Liogyrus*, Gill or "Lyogyrus" appears to possess this only conchological character (the last whorl loose from the preceding), by which it may be distinguished from some of the

species of Valvate possessing an elevated spire; hence this feature alone has but slight value, and I have always referred it to Valvata as a subgenus, before anything was known of its anatomy. The said character is not generic, even subgeneric, and I must remark that in the *same species*, chiefly in Cyclostomide (*Ostodes liberatus*, Mousson, for instance), the last whorl is more or less solute.

The two New Caledonia fluviatile shells, *Heterocyclus Perroquini* and *Valvata Petiti*, were originally generically separated by Mr. Crosse on account of this feature occurring in the former only, although the other ones are nearly the same in the two, namely that of the peristome being more or less expanded or reflected in both. This very striking particular alone should justify the distinctness of *Heterocyclus* from *Lyogyrus* or *Valvata*; but nothing of the anatomy being known we are not authorized to declare it generically separable, notwithstanding the locality, the two shells being restricted to the lakes of Southern New Caledonia.

In regard to *Thomsonia* and the only species, *carinifera*, Anc. (= *Physa* ("Paludina") *scalaris*, Jay), related to it, I must say, at first, that the subgeneric name proposed is *Thomsonia*, not *Thompsonia*, and should the latter be already preoccupied in another branch of Natural History, the name proposed would stand, being at least as much different from *Thompsonia*, as *Helix Raimondii*, Phil., is from *Helix Remondi*, Tryon, *Helix Raymondii*, Moq., etc. I must add that I am not aware that even *Thomsonia* is not also preoccupied in Zoölogy, for nobody is universal, and although having published on Entomology as well as Conchology, I have not particularly studied every part of Natural History; this should, I think, be a sufficient apology for giving such a name.

My excuse for changing the name of *Helix Harfordiana*, W. G. Binney (not J. G. Cooper) to *commutanda*, is that my paper was sent for printing when Tryon's name was still unpublished or rather when his work had not yet reached Europe. Similar facts commonly happen, and authors are, in this case, fairly excusable.

I will remark upon another observation in Mr. Pilsbry's article: "Although American Conchologists have not been finding 'new species' of fresh water shells in the Eastern States for the last decade or two, Continental writers, with delicious coolness, continue to describe 'novelties' from Massachusetts, Maryland and other well-known localities."

I never described shells from these localities, but we always must bear in mind the fact that N. American shells have never been treated in the same way that European. There is in America a tendency to restrain the specific forms, and not to admit a shell to specific rank before the animal, anatomic features and particularly dentition be known. The celebrated American scientist, Mr. W. G. Binney, several years since, wrote me about this, concluding that "our system may be a good one, but *that he wished to be consistent.*" In Europe, we admit to specific rank whenever a shell offers sufficient, even slight, but constant characters, should these characters be the result of station, food, climate, etc., such circumstances often being quite uneasy and generally impossible to determine.

Besides this, the Eastern States will doubtless afford a number of *small* new species, when the ponds, rivers, etc.—particularly in the drifts and alluvions—will be as much thoroughly explored as similar places have already been searched for in France, where quite unexpected forms of *Lartetia*, *Paladilhia*, *Moitessieria* in still better known localities are discovered, and where the mountainous countries daily yield an increasing number of *Zonitidae*, *Pupidae*, etc., hitherto not discovered by earlier conchologists *inhabiting the country*. A trip in the Pyrenean region in 1884 was very successful in this way, and amongst the novelties I then found, I may mention the fine *Hyalina Anceyi*, West., and the *Paladilhia*-like shell I have alluded to.

NOTE UPON MR. ANCEY'S CRITICISM.

BY H. A. PILSBRY.

Upon reading over my short article, written over a year ago, to which the above criticism is a reply, I find that I am prepared to stand by every word of it as far as matters of *fact* are concerned; and I feel confident that increased knowledge in the future will confirm my statements. I regret that it was so written as to seem to Mr. Ancey "inconsiderate." Nothing is more painful than a real or fancied violation of those amenities which should characterize all the relations between naturalists; and I am glad of this opportunity of expressing my esteem for Mr. Ancey, whose work and attainments are well known to all conchologists.